

REMARKS

As an initial matter, applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned in the telephone interview conducted between the Examiner and the undersigned on February 5, 2009.

Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 21 were pending, with claims 13, 16 and 19 having previously been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. By this Amendment, claim 21 has been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-10 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 would remain pending upon entry of the amendment, with claims 1-10 being in independent form.

Claims 1, 4, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,023,573 to Ohhashi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,107,395 to Ofek et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,005 to Thorne et al. Claims 2, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek. Claims 3, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and further in view of Simpson et al. (US 20040036907 A1). Claims 10, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and Simpson et al. and further in view of well-known principles in the art of image processing. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and Thorne et al and further in view of well-known principles in the art of image processing. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and further in view of well-known principles in the art of image processing. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and Thorne and further in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,757,698 to McBride.

As discussed in the telephone interview, applicant respectfully submits that the present application is allowable over the cited art, for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose or suggest the aspects of the present application that the facsimile apparatus comprises a first data storage mechanism inaccessible through the local area network and configured to store image data representing a document image, wherein if it is determined that the received document image data is confidential, the received document image data is stored in the facsimile apparatus *ONLY* in said first image data storing mechanism that is inaccessible through the local area network. Each of independent claims 1-10 addresses such aspects, as well as additional features.

Ohhashi, as understood by applicant, proposes an image transmission device which contains multiple memories. One of the memories (the fourth memory 23) is not explicitly connected to a local area network. However, as acknowledged in the Office Action, this memory is not configured to store image data representing a document image.

Further, Ohhashi proposes control of transmission, from the image transmission device by e-mail or by facsimile transmission, of image data that is determined to correspond to specific registered documents (that are prone to be forged, such as paper money, valuable securities, etc.).

However, Ohhashi does not teach or suggest that it is desirable to determine whether the image data is confidential, nor that if it is confidential, the image data should be stored only in storage that is inaccessible from the local area network.

As discussed in the telephone conference, Ohhashi merely proposes control by transmitting the image data to the requesting party. However, Ohhashi does not involve a system wherein a remote terminal (that is, remote from the facsimile apparatus) can download, through

the local area network, image data stored in another storage mechanism that is in the facsimile apparatus and is accessible through the local area network. In conventional systems that have the remote access feature, the image data is stored in one storage mechanism accessible through the network, without distinction regarding whether the image data is confidential.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references, including Ohhashi, the aspects of the present application that the facsimile apparatus comprises a first data storage mechanism inaccessible through the local area network and configured to store image data representing a document image, wherein if it is determined that the received document image data is confidential, the received document image data is stored in the facsimile apparatus *ONLY* in said first image data storing mechanism that is inaccessible through the local area network.

Ofek, as understood by applicant, proposes a plurality of storage nodes, all connected to other devices via a network.

However, all of the storage nodes proposed in Ofek are accessible through a network. For example, in Figure 8, referenced by Examiner, the primary storage node 82a is connected through a network to the host computer 80a, a second primary storage node 80b which is connected to the host computer 80b, as well as a switching network 84. Secondary storage node 87 is also shown connected through a network to primary storage node 82, switched network 84, as well as a tape storage unit 83.

Ofek does not disclose or suggest that any of the storage nodes is or should be inaccessible to devices connected to a network. Every storage node depicted by Ofek is accessible through a network. Thus, Ofek *teaches away* from a memory which is not accessible through a local area network.

In addition, Ofek, like Ohhashi, does not disclose or suggest that any of the storage nodes

are configured to store image data representing a document image.

There is no disclosure or suggestion in Ofek that the “logical data block” of Ofek is analogous, equivalent, or inclusive of the document image data of the present application.

Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine the memory (which is not connected to a network) of Ohhashi with the multiple storage nodes of Ofek.

Thorne, as understood by Applicant, proposes an approach for communicating messages, such as e-mail, between computers connected to a network while providing selectable degrees of security for each message. An originating computer transmits a message having a header which specifies, in addition to the address of the intended recipient computer, one or more security parameters (such as instructions for erasure of the data message following its storage in the recipient computer, instructions as to whether copying, archiving, forwarding and printing of the data message is permitted, etc.) which control the processing of the data message in the recipient computer. The recipient computer processes the data message in accord with the instructions.

However, while the receiving terminal may follow an instruction not to copy or duplicate the received message in Thorne, Thorne says nothing whatsoever regarding configuring a facsimile apparatus to include a first data storage mechanism that is inaccessible through the local area network and is configured to store image data representing a document image, wherein if it is determined that the received document image data is confidential, the received document image data is stored in the facsimile apparatus *ONLY* in said first image data storing mechanism that is inaccessible through the local area network

Ohhashi, Ofek and Thorne, even in combination, do not disclose or suggest such aspects of the present application.

Likewise, the other cited references do not disclose or suggest such aspects of the present

application.


Accordingly, applicant submits that the cited art, even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, does **NOT** render unpatentable the above-mentioned aspects of the present application.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400